



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/604,428	06/27/2000	Michelle Baker	BAK-007	4879

36822 7590 05/18/2005

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
60 LONG RIDGE ROAD
SUITE 407
STAMFORD, CT 06902

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

10

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/604,428

Applicant(s)

BAKER, MICHELLE

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Reexamination

2. The indicated allowability of claims 1-27 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Sheridan, Madsen-King references. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sheridan [5,760,917].
4. As per claim 1, Sheridan discloses an electronic mail client, comprising:
a mail handling component for sending and receiving electronic mail [Sheridan, hub station distributes email with image set, col 2 lines 20-col 3 line 15; col 4 lines 34-47 et seq.]; and
an authoring/reading component for creating electronic mail messages and for reading electronic mail messages, said authoring/reading component having at least two modes of authoring, said modes being selectable by said authoring/reading component when creating an electronic mail message [Sheridan, select image signal

set or sets to be shared with others, access rights can include the right to view the image set signals, col 4 lines 48-col 5 lines 42]

each mode causes the electronic mail message to be displayed in a different manner when read by the authoring/reading component [Sheridan, email with a request to access the image set accordance with the granted access right, col 5 lines 47-64 et seq.].

5. Claim 8 contains the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

6. As per claims 2,9 Sheridan discloses said two modes are selected from the group consisting of customer and vendor, teacher and student, auctioneer and bidder, and doctor and patient as inherent feature of users.

7. As per claims 3,10 Sheridan discloses the mode of a message is encoded in the message and determined by the authoring/reading component when the message is created [Sheridan, encryption/decryption, col 7 lines 1-67].

8. As per claims 4,24 Sheridan discloses the mode of a message is encoded as a MIME-type as inherent feature of Internet email encoding.

9. As per claims 5,11 Sheridan discloses a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient-of the message to use a first set of tools to respond to the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to use a second set of tools to respond to the message, said first set of tools and said second set of tools being different from each other [Sheridan, select image signal set or sets to be shared with others, access rights can include the right to view the image set signals, col 4 lines 48-col 5 lines 42].

10. As per claims 6,12 Sheridan discloses a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see all of the information contained in the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see a only subset of the information contained in the message as inherent feature of access rights.

11. As per claims 7,13 Sheridan discloses a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see the information contained in the message organized in the same way it appeared during creation of the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes prevents a recipient of the message from seeing the information contained in the message organized in the same way it appeared during creation of the message, and only allows the recipient to see the information organized in a different way as inherent feature of access rights.

12. As per claim 14, Sheridan discloses an electronic mail client; a) a plurality of authoring/reading components for creating and viewing representation of information [Sheridan, select image signal set or sets to be shared with others, access rights can include the right to view the image set signals, col 4 lines 48-col 5 lines 42];

b) encoding means for automatically encoding representations created with said authoring/reading components into an Internet-compatible email message; and d) decoding means for automatically decoding said representations encoded by said encoding means, wherein at least one of said authoring/reading component is responsive to a role mode encoded in an email message whereby said role mode determines how information in said email message will be displayed [Sheridan, encryption/decryption, col 7 lines 1-67].

13. Claims 15-18 contain the similar limitations set forth of claims 2,5-7 respectively. Therefore, claims 15-18 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claims 2,5-7.

14. As per claim 19, Hawana discloses a) a main email component for sending and receiving messages; and b) a plurality of installable authoring/reading components for creating and reading messages, said main email component communicates with said authoring/reading components through a bidirectional application programming interface (i.e.: browser) [Sheridan, WWW, Fig 1].

15. As per claim 20, Sheridan discloses said application programming interface provides at least one function call to said main email client by an authoring/reading component selected from the group consisting of get message, send message, save message, pass message, get registered users, enable button, disable button, and kill component as inherent feature of Web browser [Sheridan, WWW, Fig 1].

16. As per claim 21, Sheridan discloses said application programming interface provides at least one function call to an authoring/reading component by said main email client selected from the group consisting of close window, get component info, initialize window, send message, open message, reply message, clear message, print message as inherent feature of Web browser [Sheridan, WWW, Fig 1].

17. Claim 22 contains the similar limitations set forth of method claim 14. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 14.

18. As per claim 23, Sheridan discloses the role mode is selected from the group consisting of customer and vendor, teacher and student, auctioneer and bidder, and doctor and patient as inherent feature of user selected mode or access rights.

19. As per claim 25, Sheridan discloses the role mode determines what tools may be used by the email client to view the representation of information as inherent feature of user selected mode or access rights.

20. As per claim 26, Sheridan discloses the role mode determines what tools may be used by the email client to respond to the message as inherent feature of user selected mode or access rights.

21. As per claim 27, Sheridan discloses the role mode determines how much of the representation of information can be viewed by the email client as inherent feature of user selected mode or access rights.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable Madsen et al [Madsen 6,151,620] in view of King et al [King 6,353,839 B1].

22. As per claim 1, Madsen discloses an electronic mail client [Madsen, a conference messaging system, abstract], comprising:

a mail handling component for sending and receiving electronic mail [Madsen, email system, col 11 lines 45-67]; and

an authoring/reading component for creating electronic mail messages and for reading electronic mail messages, [Madsen, the user only has access to the functions

presented in the user interface of read mail, send mail, view address book, col 11 lines 45-67].

However Madsen does not explicitly detail "said authoring/reading component having at least two modes of authoring, said modes being selectable by said authoring/reading component when creating an electronic mail message, wherein each mode causes the electronic mail message to be displayed in a different manner when read by the authoring/reading component"

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the email apparatus and found King teaching. King discloses a method of transmitting and receiving an email including the processing to make and display Email by Email software run by user in two modes: create new message activity and view message activity [King, col 10 lines 55-67]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of display email in create mode and view mode as taught by King into the Madsen's apparatus in order to utilize the user authoring access. Doing so would provide a great need for a generic solution to managing the client state information into display pages in thin client devices like mobile devices.

23. As per claim 2, Madsen-King disclose said two modes are selected from the group consisting of customer and vendor, teacher and student, auctioneer and bidder, and doctor and patient as inherent feature of users.

24. As per claim 3, Madsen-King disclose the mode of a message is encoded in the message and determined by the authoring/reading component when the message is created [Madsen, encryption, col 6 lines 55-67].

25. As per claim 4, Madsen-King disclose the mode of a message is encoded as a MIME-type as inherent feature of Internet email encoding [Madsen, encryption, col 6 lines 55-67].

26. As per claim 5, Madsen-King disclose a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient-of the message to use a first set of tools to respond to the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to use a second set of tools to respond to the message, said first set of tools and said second set of tools being different from each other [King, create new message activity and view message activity, col 10 lines 55-67].

27. As per claim 6, Madsen-King disclose a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see all of the information contained in the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see a only subset of the information contained in the message [King; create new message activity and view message activity, col 10 lines 55-67].

Art Unit: 2142

28. As per claim 7, Madsen-King disclose a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see the information contained in the message organized in the same way it appeared during creation of the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes prevents a recipient of the message from seeing the information contained in the message organized in the same way it appeared during creation of the message, and only allows the recipient to see the information organized in a different way [King, create new message activity and view message activity, col 10 lines 55-67].

29. Claims 8-27 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claims 1-7.

Therefore, claims 8-27 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claims 1-7.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Rupal Dharia*, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

